

## CBM International

### Call with the IRP, 14.11.2019

#### Minutes

##### Participants:

- Kirsty Smith, Chairperson, International Leadership Team, CEO, CBM UK
- Dominique Schlupkothen, International Executive Office Director, CBM International
- Friederike Römer, Accountability, Strategy and Annual Planning Coordinator, CBM International
- Jeremy Sandbrook, Independent Review Panel
- Mihir Bhatt, Independent Review Panel
- Ezgi Akarsu, Programme Manager, Accountable Now

The call allowed an opportunity to discuss the Independent Review Panel's feedback on CBM's 2018 accountability report. As the report was an interim report which the Panel found to be strong, there were no pressing issues questions or clarifications to address.

The **Panel congratulated CBM on their consistent progress** on accountability issues, and appreciated the additional information on accountability related developments beyond those the Panel had enquired about in their last feedback letter.

CBM thanked the Panel for their feedback and recommendations, which they found to be very helpful. In response to the Panel's recommendation, **CBM has already separated its website pages about [quality and assurance](#), and [reporting channels and safeguarding](#)**. Both can easily be found via the navigation bar's "About CBM" tab. The Panel appreciates CBM's swift response on this.

Another issue the Panel had flagged was **staff development**. CBM clarified that further developing and improving the existing staff development system unfortunately had to be put on hold in the reporting period due to internal developments, but CBM hopes to address this moving into 2020.

CBM expressed their intent to submit their next accountability report in April rather than June, in order to receive the Panel's feedback sooner and be able to better address and implement actions. The Secretariat appreciates this, and the fact that the Panel's feedback is being used constructively.

CBM also raised a **general question around evaluations**. At times, the need to ensure not only rigour but to present evaluations in more academically recognised formats can result in evaluations not being published, as they might not be perceived as formally acceptable. There is also an increasing number of different ways of



evaluating work outside of formal evaluation structures, particularly which allow different voices to be heard, and sometimes informal methods can be more valuable or useful than formal responses. The same is true for complaints mechanism methodologies. CBM asked whether there was any good practice examples AN could share in this regard. AN will share any resources we might be able to find, and look into linking up members to share experiences on this issue.